

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 595

EA 004 179

TITLE [The Educational Resources Management System:
Application of PPBES Concepts to Education.]
INSTITUTION Association of School Business Officials, Chicago,
Ill.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 63p.; A report of the ASBO Convention Research
Committee (Montreal, Canada, October 23-28, 1971)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Budgeting; Educational
Accountability; *Educational Resources; Evaluation;
Management; *Management Development; *Management
Systems; National Surveys; Planning; Programing;
Resource Allocations; Systems Approach; *Systems
Concepts; *Systems Development

ABSTRACT

This document reports the results of a survey of school business officials to determine the status of Educational Resource Management Systems (ERMS) or Planning-Programing-Budgeting-Evaluating Systems (PPBES) in school districts and colleges in the United States and Canada. Though the actual number of school districts developing management systems has increased considerably since 1967, only a small percentage of districts in the two countries is engaged in developing a systems approach. Charts showing how participation was initiated, which groups have been active, and what stages of development have been implemented are also included. (RA)

Assoc. of School Business Officials
2424 W. Lawrence Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

1971

AR ENT TH
DICATION & V LEA
CE OF EDUC TIO
THIS MENT HAS BEEN RE
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

[The Educational Resources Management System: Application
of PPBES Concepts to Education.]

Introduction

The writers of the Educational Resources Management System hope that the system developed by the ASBO Research Corporation may serve as a guide to apply the best of the PPBES Concepts to Education. Administrators should be cautioned that much research is required before PPBES or ERMS can be fully implemented. School districts or colleges attempting to design, develop and implement an educational resources management system, to any reasonable degree of sophistication, should plan on a minimum developmental period of three to five years. Some experts advise that the full implementation of an effective system for ERMS will require more than five years.

Many obstacles stand in the way of a full implementation of ERMS. The obstacles represent an adherence to traditions--a reluctance to change from the familiar. The report of this Convention Committee is charged with the responsibility of bringing ASBO members an up-to-date report on the status of EMRS as of Spring 1971.

The survey form, shown on pages 2 and 3, was sent to 4,146 members of ASBO early in 1971. The inventory instrument was designed and distributed to help the ASBO Research Committee determine the status of PPBES within its school district and college membership.

with your colleagues...Return only one reply for each school district.

ERM Research Committee

of the

Association of School Business Officials

Dr. LaMar L. Hill, Chairman

School District _____ Pupil Membership _____

Address _____ city, state, province

Information furnished by _____

Position _____

Telephone No. _____

Please read the enclosed "Summary of System Features" before completing the questionnaire. Answer by checking the appropriate space.

YES NO

1. Has a system for supporting decision-making, to include the features of the ERMS or PPBES, been authorized by:

a. Your State or Province Educational Agency? _____

b. Your local governing board? _____

2. Has your school district made plans for developing an ERM or PPBE? _____

3. Is your school district engaged in developing a system for ERM or PPBE? _____

4. Has your school district used the services of a paid consultant for developing an ERMS or a PPBES? _____

5. Has your state or Province Educational Agency provided assistance for developing a system? _____

If you are now operating an ERMS or a PPBES

or

If plans are underway for the development of an ERMS or a PPBES,

Please answer the questions on the next page.

FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS OPERATING OR INITIATING
AN ERMS OR A PPBES

6. Who took the initiative in starting the system? (Mark an "S" in the response space.)

Who is currently the most active leader? (Mark an "A" in the response space.)

___a. Superintendent

___d. The Board or a board member

___b. Business Official

___e. Other (Name the position)

___c. Instructional Staff member

7. Which of the following participated in the development-implementation process of the system?

___a. Teachers

___c. Community leaders

___b. Classified Personnel

___d. Others (Name the group)

8. Mark in number order each of the following items which has been accomplished or is a part of your system for the ERMS or the PPBES. (Mark the first to be accomplished as 1, etc.)

___a. Steering Committee

___b. Planning team named

___c. Goals and objective team named

___d. Programming team named

___e. Budgeting team named

___f. Evaluating team named

___g. Time schedule prepared

___h. Cost analysis model in use

___i. Program structure accepted

___j. Cost/effectiveness model in use

9. Do you have samples of the instructions, forms or other materials developed thus far which you are willing to share?

Send to: Research Library

Association of School Business Officials

2424 West Lawrence Avenue

Chicago, Illinois 60625

RETURN BOTH PAGES IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE -- NO POSTAGE IS REQUIRED.

The State of the Art

For purposes of giving a means of evaluation of Canada and the United States the charts on the following pages were developed. Many of the items included in the survey can be grouped for purposes of analysis. The charts will be developed for determining what the status may be in terms of the size of the schools participating in the survey, their status and their outside source of guidance, the individuals responsible for initiation, groups participating in the development of the plans and a final chart that indicates the status of the various stages of ERMS or PPBES development.

The first chart (page 7) deals with the number of schools in Canada and the United States participating in the inventory and the size of the districts. It should be noted that the inventory submitted to 4,146 members representing 2,832 member districts and colleges. There were 1,327 respondents which represents approximately 32% responding, however, members were requested not to send more than one reply for each district.

Chart two (page 7) indicates the stages of development for those schools reporting. The relationship of those schools involved and those not involved in plans for development varies greatly between states--namely 1 to 15 for South Dakota to 64 to 43 in California. In development New York showed 6 to 65 ratio compared to 14 to 7 ratio in Florida. Consultants have not been

utilized very extensively and the state offices have not offered much assistance. It should be noted, however, that 318 reported that the decision has been authorized; 387 have plans for developing a system; 362 are developing the system; 101 are using consultants and 169 reported that the state or province is assisting in providing a system. An example is California whose State Department of Education and the Advisory Commission on School Budgeting and Accounting are currently using 14 pilot school districts, and one county to develop, implement and test a Educational Resources Management System.

These figures indicate that only a small percentage of the school districts of Canada and the United States are engaged in developing a ERMS or PPBE System. Nevertheless; there is a marked increase in the number of school districts in Canada and the United States that are either developing or planning and ERMS or PPBE System since a survey was made in 1967.

Chart III (page 8) indicates how participation was initiated. Interestingly enough the school business official seems to be spearheading most of the situations.

Chart IV (page 8) indicates which groups have been active. It is good to see that more schools have been inviting teachers, classified personnel and others to aid in the development of the system. It may be suprising to note that only 38 schools indicate the use of community leaders in the developmental stages of the ERM System.

Chart V (page 9) compares the status to which systems have been developed. If the importance of the item is judged by its status at the time of the inventory it would indicate that the

design of an ERM System is done in the following order:

1. Planning team named	126
2. Steering Committee named	98
3. Budgeting team named	97
4. Goals and objectives team	95
5. Time schedule prepared	92
6. Program structure accepted	68
7. Programing team named	63
8. Cost analysis model in use	49
9. Evaluating team named	41
10. Cost effectiveness model in use	11

Further analysis shows, however, that 69 respondents stated that (A.) Steering Committee ranked first in their program and 57 reported that (B.) Planning team named ranked second in importance- indicating that the value of each item is not at all the same in the 362 districts and colleges developing a system.

CHART I
SCHOOL MEMBERSHIP

AREAS	TYPE OF SCHOOL		SCHOOL MEMBERSHIP						
	Unified	College	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50001-over
Canada	57		1		4	16	11	14	7
United States	1248	79	59	126	405	319	203	115	13
TOTAL	1305	79	60	126	409	335	214	129	20
Approx. Percent Dist.			4.6	9.7	31.3	25.7	16.4	9.9	1.5

CHART II
STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

AREAS	DECISION MAKING AUTHORIZED		PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT		IN DEVELOPMENT		PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		STATE ASSISTANCE	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Canada	12	40	14	42	12	45	3	54	12	45
United States	318	1014	387	875	352	936	101	1120	169	998
TOTAL	330	1054	401	917	374	981	104	1174	181	1043

CHART III

INITIATIVE IN STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM:

	INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES
A. <u>Superintendent</u>			
Canada	2		
United States	90	24	35
B. <u>Business Official</u>			
Canada	5	4	3
United States	57	63	108
C. <u>Instructional Staff</u>			
Canada		1	
United States	3	16	5
D. <u>Board/Board Member</u>			
Canada	3		
United States	25	2	6
E. <u>Other</u>			
Canada	1	3	
United States	13	36	12

CHART IV

GROUPS PARTICIPATING IN DEVELOPMENT

	ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
A. <u>Teachers</u>			
Canada		3	2
United States	33	31	41
B. <u>Classified Personnel</u>			
Canada	4	5	1
United States	55	36	24
C. <u>Community Leaders</u>			
Canada			
United States	8	4	26
D. <u>Others</u>			
Canada	2	2	1
United States	49	35	32

CHART V

STATUS IN SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

The following Steps were accomplished or are part of the System for the ERMS or the PPBES:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	C	US	C	US	C	US	C	US	C	US
A. Steering Committee	6	69		15						
B. Planning Team Named	2	42	5	57						
C. Goals and Objective Team Named		18	2	30						
D. Programming Team Named		9		15	3	10				
E. Budgeting Team Named	1	19		17	1	22	1	11		
F. Evaluating Team Named		4		5		5		2	8	
G. Time Schedule Prepared		13		12	2	21	2	21		
H. Cost Analysis Model in Use		7	1	2		8		4	1	7
I. Program Structure Accepted		6		11	1	11	2	11	1	6
J. Cost Effectiveness Model in Use		2								3

Summary

In summary it must be stated that there is much interest in ERMS or PPBES in education. There has been a marked increase in development and implementation of systems in the past 4 years.

Superintendents now seem to lead the field in initiating or starting the system, however, business administrators still are the most active leaders currently.

It appears that teachers and classified employees are showing more interest in participating in ERMS development. Not too suprising is the fact that we are still a little skeptical in using community leaders in system development.

Again we should be reminded that it is the goal of the creators of the ASBO conceptual ERM System to provide a vehicle for local school districts and colleges which, when applied will encourage:

1. Involvement of citizens, staff and students in planning and decision making.
2. Responsiveness to change and the needs of the learners.
3. Long range planning.
4. Determination of priorities.
5. Thorough analysis of the alternatives.
6. Effective identification and allocation of resources, especially personnel.
7. Adequate display to the public of resource allocation in relation to programs.
8. Accountability to the public in relating resource utilization to outcomes.

PPBES Survey of ASBO Members

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MCNIGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-ARKANSAS

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

2 1 1 1 1

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

3 3 3 3 3

6- INITIATIVE STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE MORE THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

Assn. of School Business Officials
2424 W. Lawrence Avenue
Chicago, IL 60625

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-ALABAMA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.		2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS		3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT		4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
		1	2	1	2		3		3

6- INITIATIVE #1-STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING LEADER BOTH
ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER
- A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-ARIZONA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
1978	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1979	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1981	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1982	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1983	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1984	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1985	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1986	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1987	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1988	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1989	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1990	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1991	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1992	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1993	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1994	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1995	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1996	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1997	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1998	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1999	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2000	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2001	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2002	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2003	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2004	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2005	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2006	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2007	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2008	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2009	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2010	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2011	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2012	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2013	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2014	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2015	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2016	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2017	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2018	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2019	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					

11 2 4 6 3 4

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ECONOMIC PROGRAM	3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
3	20	10	6	14	1	19	1	23

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9
10	10	10
11	11	11
12	12	12
13	13	13
14	14	14
15	15	15
16	16	16
17	17	17
18	18	18
19	19	19
20	20	20
21	21	21
22	22	22
23	23	23
24	24	24
25	25	25
26	26	26
27	27	27
28	28	28
29	29	29
30	30	30
31	31	31
32	32	32
33	33	33
34	34	34
35	35	35
36	36	36
37	37	37
38	38	38
39	39	39
40	40	40
41	41	41
42	42	42
43	43	43
44	44	44
45	45	45
46	46	46
47	47	47
48	48	48
49	49	49
50	50	50
51	51	51
52	52	52
53	53	53
54	54	54
55	55	55
56	56	56
57	57	57
58	58	58
59	59	59
60	60	60
61	61	61
62	62	62
63	63	63
64	64	64
65	65	65
66	66	66
67	67	67
68	68	68
69	69	69
70	70	70
71	71	71
72	72	72
73	73	73
74	74	74
75	75	75
76	76	76
77	77	77
78	78	78
79	79	79
80	80	80
81	81	81
82	82	82
83	83	83
84	84	84
85	85	85
86	86	86
87	87	87
88	88	88
89	89	89
90	90	90
91	91	91
92	92	92
93	93	93
94	94	94
95	95	95
96	96	96
97	97	97
98	98	98
99	99	99
100	100	100

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

[illegible]

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STA.
D. GC/ACU/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OK ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

A. STEERING COMMITTEE 2
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 1

C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED

D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED

E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED

F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED

G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED

3.1. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE

1. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

4. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-ALASKA

Y P E

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
		3	1			1				

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHIZD.		2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS		3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT		4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
2	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	3

6- INITIATIVE AND STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

[illegible]

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9
10	10	10
11	11	11
12	12	12
13	13	13
14	14	14
15	15	15
16	16	16
17	17	17
18	18	18
19	19	19
20	20	20
21	21	21
22	22	22
23	23	23
24	24	24
25	25	25
26	26	26
27	27	27
28	28	28
29	29	29
30	30	30
31	31	31
32	32	32
33	33	33
34	34	34
35	35	35
36	36	36
37	37	37
38	38	38
39	39	39
40	40	40
41	41	41
42	42	42
43	43	43
44	44	44
45	45	45
46	46	46
47	47	47
48	48	48
49	49	49
50	50	50
51	51	51
52	52	52
53	53	53
54	54	54
55	55	55
56	56	56
57	57	57
58	58	58
59	59	59
60	60	60
61	61	61
62	62	62
63	63	63
64	64	64
65	65	65
66	66	66
67	67	67
68	68	68
69	69	69
70	70	70
71	71	71
72	72	72
73	73	73
74	74	74
75	75	75
76	76	76
77	77	77
78	78	78
79	79	79
80	80	80
81	81	81
82	82	82
83	83	83
84	84	84
85	85	85
86	86	86
87	87	87
88	88	88
89	89	89
90	90	90
91	91	91
92	92	92
93	93	93
94	94	94
95	95	95
96	96	96
97	97	97
98	98	98
99	99	99
100	100	100

A. SUPERINTENDENT	1
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL	1
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF	
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER	1
E. OTHER	1

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
UR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM.FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PBES

— 1 —

-2-
1

-3-
1

1-4-

-5-

11

11 -6-

71

۱۸۱

-9-

-10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-CALIFORNIA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING 3- ENGAGED IN 4-PAID CONSULTANT 5-STATE OR PROVINCE
SYSTEM AUTHZD. ERMS OR PPBS DEVELOPMENT UTILIZED PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

87 67 64 43 75 36 17 90

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

A. SUPERINTENDENT 16 4 7 7 9 8 11
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 10 10 28 3 9 3 9
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF 2 4 3 1 3 3 8
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 2 4 1 1 1 5 8
E. OTHER 4 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE -1- 20 -2- 5 -3- 4 -4- 3 -5- 3 -6- 1 -7- 1 -8- 1 -9- 1 -10- 1
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 2 13 11 6 2 1 2 1 1 2
C. GOALS AND LBJ TEAM NAMED 3 2 2 2 3 2 1 1 1 2
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 3 1 2 2 3 2 1 1 1 2
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 3 1 2 2 3 2 1 1 1 2
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 5 3 4 2 1 1 1 1 1 2
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-CANADA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
	57	1	4	16	11	14	7				

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTH'D.		2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS		3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT		4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
12	40	14	42	12	45	3	54	12	45

6- INITIATIVE AND STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

	INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES	A. TEACHERS	B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL	C. COMMUNITY LEADER	D. OTHERS	ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
1. SUPERINTENDENT	2								3	2
2. BUSINESS OFFICIAL	5	4	3		4				5	1
3. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF		1						1		
4. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER	3							2	2	1
5. OTHER	1	3								

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

	-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-
TERMS OR THE PPBES										
A. STEERING COMMITTEE	6					1				
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED	2	5								
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED		2			1	1				
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED			3		1	1				
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED	1		1	1						
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED					2					
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED			2	2						
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE		1			1					
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED			1	2	1					

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-CONNECTICUT

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

29 3 1 11 8 10 1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

1 21 16 16 12 19 4 28 4 27

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-COLORADO

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

[illegible]

	2	.	1	4	5	2	1	4	2	4	13
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS	3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
-------------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	9	4	13	3	14	1	16	3
								14

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

[illegible]

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9
10	10	10
11	11	11
12	12	12
13	13	13
14	14	14
15	15	15
16	16	16
17	17	17
18	18	18
19	19	19
20	20	20
21	21	21
22	22	22
23	23	23
24	24	24
25	25	25
26	26	26
27	27	27
28	28	28
29	29	29
30	30	30
31	31	31
32	32	32
33	33	33
34	34	34
35	35	35
36	36	36
37	37	37
38	38	38
39	39	39
40	40	40
41	41	41
42	42	42
43	43	43
44	44	44
45	45	45
46	46	46
47	47	47
48	48	48
49	49	49
50	50	50
51	51	51
52	52	52
53	53	53
54	54	54
55	55	55
56	56	56
57	57	57
58	58	58
59	59	59
60	60	60
61	61	61
62	62	62
63	63	63
64	64	64
65	65	65
66	66	66
67	67	67
68	68	68
69	69	69
70	70	70
71	71	71
72	72	72
73	73	73
74	74	74
75	75	75
76	76	76
77	77	77
78	78	78
79	79	79
80	80	80
81	81	81
82	82	82
83	83	83
84	84	84
85	85	85
86	86	86
87	87	87
88	88	88
89	89	89
90	90	90
91	91	91
92	92	92
93	93	93
94	94	94
95	95	95
96	96	96
97	97	97
98	98	98
99	99	99
100	100	100

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

2	2
2	1
1	

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

11

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PROBES

1

-2-

- 3 -

-4-

151

-6-

-7-

४

-9-

-10-

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED

نما

1

U. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED

1

1

F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED

1

H. CGST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
 SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
 DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-DELAWARE

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTH12D.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	9	1	9	9	10	10	10	1	10

6- INITIATIVE STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-GEORGIA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

3 1

2

2

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD, 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

3

1

3

1

3

1

3

1

3

711

21

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-HAWAII

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1

1

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

1970.

6- INITIATIVE STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

1

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-IDA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
34	7	2	8	12	10	5				

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
EKMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES
2

NO
39

55
56
57

NO
33

YES
4

36

YES
1

40

YES
I

NO 39

6- INITIATIVE ^{IN} STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

[illegible]

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9
10	10	10
11	11	11
12	12	12
13	13	13
14	14	14
15	15	15
16	16	16
17	17	17
18	18	18
19	19	19
20	20	20
21	21	21
22	22	22
23	23	23
24	24	24
25	25	25
26	26	26
27	27	27
28	28	28
29	29	29
30	30	30
31	31	31
32	32	32
33	33	33
34	34	34
35	35	35
36	36	36
37	37	37
38	38	38
39	39	39
40	40	40
41	41	41
42	42	42
43	43	43
44	44	44
45	45	45
46	46	46
47	47	47
48	48	48
49	49	49
50	50	50
51	51	51
52	52	52
53	53	53
54	54	54
55	55	55
56	56	56
57	57	57
58	58	58
59	59	59
60	60	60
61	61	61
62	62	62
63	63	63
64	64	64
65	65	65
66	66	66
67	67	67
68	68	68
69	69	69
70	70	70
71	71	71
72	72	72
73	73	73
74	74	74
75	75	75
76	76	76
77	77	77
78	78	78
79	79	79
80	80	80
81	81	81
82	82	82
83	83	83
84	84	84
85	85	85
86	86	86
87	87	87
88	88	88
89	89	89
90	90	90
91	91	91
92	92	92
93	93	93
94	94	94
95	95	95
96	96	96
97	97	97
98	98	98
99	99	99
100	100	100

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM. FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

1

-2-

۱۳

-4-

५

9

-7-

1

1

1

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-INDIANA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

45

5

14

12

9

3

1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

45

5

42

7

40

45

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

ACTIVE
LEADER

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY
PERSON

WITH ONE
OTHER

MORE
THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT

B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL

C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER

2

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

A. SUPERINTENDENT

B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL

C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE

B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED

C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED

D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED

E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED

F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED

G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED

H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE

I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-IDAHO

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

8

4

1

2

1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

1

7

2

6

1

7

8

8

6- INITIATIVE IN-STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

ACTIVE
LEADER

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY
PERSON

WITH ONE
OTHER MORE
THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-ILLINOIS

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
132	3	12	27	38	48	19	5	2		

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHIZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PÄID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
26	128	39	111	36	115	7	137	5	142

1353.

6- INITIATIVE W/ STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

**INITIATIVE
STARTING** **ACTIVE
LEADER**

**BOTH
ROLES**

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

**ONLY
PERSON**

WITH ONE MORE
OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT	6	1
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL	4	4
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF		4
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER	1	
E. OTHER		2

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1 4 9

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR TAKE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

—
I
—

-2-

3

-4-

५

-6-

-2-

8

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

1 1 1 3 3 5

12298

111 5 3

1
2
2

[illegible]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INNOVATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-KANSAS

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES	3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
14	8	9	1	2
		3	15	14

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE
STARTING LEADER

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

2 1 1

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

1 1 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

1 1 1 1 1 1 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-KENTUCKY

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

8

1

3

2

2

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM UTILIZED

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

1

6

2

5

2

5

8

1

7

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

ACTIVE
LEADER

BOTH
ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY
PERSON

WITH ONE
OTHER

MORE
THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL

D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1

1

1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- SEEKING COMMITTEE
- PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-LOUISIANA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

6 1 1 1 1 3

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPRES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

7 7 7 7 7

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE OTHER MORE THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

0- THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATION TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
 SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
 DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MAINE

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

7 1 3 3

1-DECISION MAKING 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING 3- ENGAGED IN 4-PAID CONSULTANT 5-STATE OR PROVINCE
 SYSTEM AUTHZD. ERMS OR PPBS DEVELOPMENT UTILIZED PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO
 1 4 4 3 4 3 2 5 1 6

001

6- INITIATIVE IN-STARTING
 THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN
 DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
 STARTING LEADER ROLES

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
 PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT 2 1
 B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 2
 D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 1
 E. OTHER 1
 A. TEACHERS
 B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL 1
 C. COMMUNITY LEADERS 1
 D. OTHERS 1

8-FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

A. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 1
 B. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED 2
 C. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 2
 D. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 2
 E. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 2
 F. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1
 G. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1
 H. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 2

-2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -9- -10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MARYLAND

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3-ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

7 5 8 6 8 6 5 10 4 10

961

44.44

31

6-INITIATIVE TEAM STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

5 2 1

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. TEACHERS 1
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL 2
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS 1
D. OTHERS 2

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

1 2

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

2

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MONTANA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

3

2

1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
EKMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

1

2

2

1

1

2

1

2

1

3

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

ACTIVE
LEADER

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

E. OTHERS

1

B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

STATE--MASSACHUSETTS

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

32 1 4 12 11 3 1 1

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

5 23 13 20 13 20 3 30 6 27

000

33

6- INITIATIVE STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE OTHER MORE THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

3 1 2 3 2 1 1

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1 4 3 1 3

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
3 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1
2 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MISSISSIPPI

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

6 1

3

1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

7

7

1

6

7

7

111

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
 SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
 DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MINNESOTA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS	3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO
14 22	14 22	8 28	5 31	2 35

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

1

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

3 4 3

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

2 1 1

2 1

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MICHIGAN

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PBES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

10 82 22 69 23 64 6 86 5 82

6- INITIATIVE STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE OTHER MORE THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT 4
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 4
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF 1
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 1
E. OTHER 1

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

6
1
1
1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PBES

A. STEERING COMMITTEE 4
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 2
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED 1
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 4
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 1
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 1
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 1
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE 1

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1
4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-MISSOURI

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE			
	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000
						50000+DR MORE

23 1

2

7

9

4

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHIZD.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS	3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO

21	3	17	2	20	1	20	21
----	---	----	---	----	---	----	----

22.1.

6- INITIATIVE 'M⁴ STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

[illegible]

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
1	1	1

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED

— 11 —

-2-

3

44-

५

9

-7-

— 8 —

-9-

10-01

- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
- J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

1

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NEBRASKA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPRES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

(44)

38

6- INITIATIVE TM-STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

B. CLASSIFIED PERSON
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE OTHER MORE THAN TWO

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NEVADA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

5

1

1

3

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBES

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

6- INITIATIVE IN-STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

ACTIVE
LEADER

BOTH
ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY
PERSON

WITH ONE
OTHER

MORE
THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MUNICOMER / COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NEW JERSEY

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

79 5 5 14 36 17 7 2 1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD,

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

4 69 17 65 15 68 3 80 5 77

001

001

6- INITIATIVE #4-STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

2 4 2 2 4 3 1 2

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1 3 1 2

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NEW MEXICO

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

6 1 1 1 3

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS 3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	6	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5

6-INITIATIVE TEAM STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE LEADER 1 BOTH ROLES 1

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE MORE THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NORTH DAKOTA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

7

3

4

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	6	2	5	2	5	2	5	1	6

951.

43

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING ACTIVE
LEADER BOTH
ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY
PERSON WITH ONE
OTHER MORE
THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

1 1

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

1

1

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
 SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
 DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-NORTH CAROLINA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

5 1 1 2 1 2

1-DECISION MAKING
 SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
 ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
 DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
 UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
 PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO
 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5

6- INITIATIVE PM-STARTING
 THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
 STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
 DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
 PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
 OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
 THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

STATE-NEW HAMPSHIRE

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-DR MORE

2 1 1 1 1

1-DECISION MAKING 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING 3- ENGAGED IN 4-PAID CONSULTANT 5-STATE OR PROVINCE

SYSTEM AUTHZD. ERMS OR PPBS DEVELOPMENT UTILIZED PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

1 2 2 1 2 1 1 1 3

0001

6- INITIATIVE ~~PK~~STARTING

THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH

STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN

DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE

PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

E. OTHER 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR

THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-OREGON

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

20 4 1 1 11 4 2 2

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

4 10 10 11 7 16 3 20 5 17

0851

6- INITIATIVE TW-STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH STARTING LEADER ROLES

ONLY WITH ONE MORE PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT 2
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 1
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF 4
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 1
E. OTHER 1
A. TEACHERS 1
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL 2
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS 1
D. OTHERS 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 1
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 1
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 1
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 1
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-OHIO

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

4 35 10 35 10 33 4 41 3 43

601.

601.

47

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

A. SUPERINTENDENT 1 1 1
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL 2 2
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF 1 1
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER 1 1
E. OTHER 2 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

A. STEERING COMMITTEE -1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED 1 1
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED 1 1
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 1
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-OKLAHOMA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	8	1	1	3	2	2	1
SECONDARY UNIFIED							
COLLEGE							
1-1000							
1001-2000							
2001-5000							
5001-10000							
10001-20000							
20001-50000							
50000-OR MORE							

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING FRMS OR PPRBS	3-- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	7	3	6	3	6	9	2

22

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES
------------------------	------------------	---------------

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADER
D. OTHERS

1 2

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PRBS

1

-2-

3

-4-

५

۱۰۵

1

8

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

1

I

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-PENNSYLVANIA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS 3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

5 1 3 3 1 1 1

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

ONLY PERSON WITH ONE MORE THAN TWO

1 2 1 1 1 1 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
- J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

-1- 1 2 -2- 1 1 -3- 1 -4- 1 -5- 1 -6- 1 -7- 1 -8- 1 -9- 1 -10- 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-RHODE ISLAND

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-GR MORE

4 1 2 1 1 1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3

1001

50

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
- J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-SOUTH CAROLINA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

9

2

3

1

2

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3-ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

1

8

1

8

1

8

1

8

1

8

(P)

51

6- INITIATIVE PM-STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE
STARTING

BOTH
ROLES

ONLY
PERSON

WITH ONE
OTHER

MORE
THAN TWO

1

1

A. TEACHERS

B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

1
ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
E RUN 6/21/71

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

Good

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

23

15

52

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
10	10	10

1

-10-

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-TENNESSEE

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.		2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPRES		3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT		4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	6	3	4	1	5	1	6	1	6

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

1

1

1

1

1
ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-TEXAS

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE		
1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000
					50000-DR
					MDRE

44	1	15	13	6	3	5
----	---	----	----	---	---	---

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.	2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPRES	3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE
-------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
34	10	24	16	19	21	1	39	27	15	

041.

100

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES
------------------------	------------------	---------------

ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
-------------	----------------	---------------

A. SUPERINTENDENT	3	1
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL		7
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF		1
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER		
E. OTHER	3	

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

[illegible]

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR:
THE ERMS OR THE PBES

I

-2-

۱۳۱

-4-

५

-9-

2.

8

-6-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED
- J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-UTAH

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

14 1 1 3 5 3 2 1

1-DECISION MAKING 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING 3- ENGAGED IN 4-PAID CONSULTANT 5-STATE OR PROVINCE
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED ERMS OR PPRES DEVELOPMENT UTILIZED PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

6 11 5 11 3 12 15 5 10

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

2 2 1

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

5

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

A. STEERING COMMITTEE 1
B. PLANNING TEAM 1
C. GOALS AND OBJECTives NAMED 1
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED 1
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED 1
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED 1
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED 1
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE 1
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED 1
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE 1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-VERMONT

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

STATE-VIRGINIA

[illegible]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
HUNICOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-WISCONSIN

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.		2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPRES		3- ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT		4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED		5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	
YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
8	38	22	33	18	37	1	56	6	51

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

	INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES
A. SUPERINTENDENT	5	4	2
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL	4	2	5
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF	1	1	1
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER	1	3	2
E. OTHER			

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

	ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
A. TEACHERS	1	2	4
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL	4	3	4
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS	1	1	3
D. OTHERS	1	1	2

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPRES

	-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-
A. STEERING COMMITTEE	3	2	1	1						
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED	3	2	1	1						
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED	1	3	3							
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED	1	2	1		1					
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED	1	3	1			1				
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED	1	1	1							
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED	2	1	1	2						
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE		2	1							
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED		1	1							

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-WEST VIRGINIA

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

7

4

2

1

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHZD.

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3- ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

7

7

7

7

7

ERM

6- INITIATIVE STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE
STARTING LEADER BOTH
ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED

OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR

THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
KOCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-WYOMING

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

8

3

3

2

1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHORIZED. 2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBS 3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT 4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED 5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO

1 6 2 6 2 6 8 2 6

951

6-INITIATIVE TEAM STARTING THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE STARTING ACTIVE LEADER BOTH ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
E. OTHER

A. TEACHERS
B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
D. OTHERS

1 1 1

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

A. STEERING COMMITTEE
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

-1- -2- -3- -4- -5- -6- -7- -8- -9- -10-

1 1

1

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-UNKNOWN

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

ELEMENTARY SECONDARY UNIFIED COLLEGE 1-1000 1001-2000 2001-5000 5001-10000 10001-20000 20001-50000 50000-OR MORE

2

2

1-DECISION MAKING
SYSTEM AUTHORIZED

2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING
ERMS OR PPBS

3-ENGAGED IN
DEVELOPMENT

4-PAID CONSULTANT
UTILIZED

5-STATE OR PROVINCE
PROVIDED ASSISTANCE

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

1

2

1

2

3

3

3

411

1745

6-INITIATIVE TEAM STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

INITIATIVE ACTIVE BOTH
STARTING LEADER ROLES

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

ONLY WITH ONE MORE
PERSON OTHER THAN TWO

- A. SUPERINTENDENT
- B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL
- C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
- D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER
- E. OTHER

- A. TEACHERS
- B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL
- C. COMMUNITY LEADERS
- D. OTHERS

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBS

-1-

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

-6-

-7-

-8-

-9-

-10-

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE
- B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED
- C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED
- D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED
- E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED
- F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED
- G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED
- H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE
- I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

ERM RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FEATURES QUEST.
DATE RUN 6/21/71

STATE-FINAL TOTAL

TYPE

PUPIL MEMBERSHIP

	ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	UNIFIED	COLLEGE	1-1000	1001-2000	2001-5000	5001-10000	10001-20000	20001-50000	50000-OR MORE
	1248	79	59	126	405	319	203	115	13		
1-DECISION MAKING SYSTEM AUTHZD.	318	1014	387	875	362	936	101	1120	169	998	
2-PLANS FOR DEVELOPING ERMS OR PPBES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3-ENGAGED IN DEVELOPMENT	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
4-PAID CONSULTANT UTILIZED	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
5-STATE OR PROVINCE PROVIDED ASSISTANCE	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	

6- INITIATIVE IN STARTING
THE SYSTEM CAME FROM

7-PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT CAME FROM

	INITIATIVE STARTING	ACTIVE LEADER	BOTH ROLES	A. TEACHERS	B. CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL	C. COMMUNITY LEADERS	D. OTHERS	ONLY PERSON	WITH ONE OTHER	MORE THAN TWO
A. SUPERINTENDENT	90	24	35	33	33	31	41	33	31	41
B. BUSINESS OFFICIAL	57	63	108	55	55	36	24	8	4	26
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF	3	16	5					49	35	32
D. BOARD/BOARD MEMBER	25	2	6							
E. OTHER	13	36	12							

8-THE FOLLOWING STEPS WERE ACCOMPLISHED
OR ARE PART OF THE SYSTEM FOR
THE ERMS OR THE PPBES

	-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-
A. STEERING COMMITTEE	69	15	1	3		1	2			
B. PLANNING TEAM NAMED	42	57	12	3	6	2	2	2	1	
C. GOALS AND OBJ TEAM NAMED	18	30	25	9	8	4	1			
D. PROGRAMMING TEAM NAMED	9	15	10	21	12	4	4	1	4	
E. BUDGETING TEAM NAMED	19	17	22	11	8	7	5	2		
F. EVALUATING TEAM NAMED	4	5	5	5	12	4	2	2	4	
G. TIME SCHEDULE PREPARED	13	12	21	21	7	7	4	1	4	
H. COST ANALYSIS MODEL IN USE	7	2	8	4	7	7	3	4	4	
I. PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACCEPTED	6	11	11	11	6	10	3	3	3	
J. COST/EFFECTIVENESS MODEL IN USE	2				2		1	2		3